



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE

---

## MORAL PROBLEMS OF INDUSTRIAL RECONSTRUCTION

### A PROFESSIONAL READING COURSE

---

Conducted by  
ALLAN HOBEN  
Carleton College

---

#### STUDY III

##### **Required Books**

Weeks, *Reconstruction Programs*.

Hobson, *National Guilds*.

Whitley Committee, *The Industrial Council Plan in Great Britain*.

In the study of reconstruction programs it is well to keep one's mind free from any supposition of finality or perfection and to examine rather the adequacy of any plan proposed. While we naturally crave complete justice and strive toward its attainment we at the same time know that there can be no static industrial heaven. The evolving order demands constant adjustment in rules and laws in order that justice may function in the changing situations. Inventions with their reorganization of work and power demand constant adjustment in the field of industrial morality, and it is probably true that greater sensitiveness and mobility in this sphere would have made the problems of the present hour less acute.

In addition to this emphasis upon what is adequate for the present time and the clear expectation of progressive change there must be in the mind of the student the will to righteousness. Unless such a purpose be in control of the whole process there can be no hope of justice in the conclusions reached. It is always true that in matters so great and so complex there is ample inducement and scope to go astray unless one is firmly devoted to justice, and the parties whose interests are at stake are most likely to be arbitrary in their demands. In this connection it will be noted that the little book on *Reconstruction Programs* is not the plea of any party to the industrial struggle but purely a piece of research work for the purpose of setting forth the programs in a form favorable to comparative study.

In reviewing the book we have a certain advantage over those who wrote the optimistic introduction of the first fourteen pages. The idealistic nature of the Great War itself is not so convincing to one who lived with the rank and file of soldiers day and night for many months. The idea of millions of men rising up voluntarily to risk death for liberty and democracy needs to be somewhat qualified

in view of the large measure of national and military compulsion actually exercised. And the thought of the war as a mobilization of moral strength for industrial readjustment needs to be tempered by the fact that it mightily fostered hatred and organized force. It also revealed afresh to the manual workers in every land the immediate dependence of society and of the state upon their toil and so absorbed the surplus products throughout the world that these toilers were clearly in the strategic position to dictate. Furthermore the conviction has become quite general that many persons made fortunes while talking patriotism and at the same time exploiting the government and the people. Great numbers of people also think that after the signing of the armistice such profiteering became very general, and the total result is that the moral reconstruction in industrial relations falls on a time by no means characterized by idealism and devotion to an inclusive human cause, but rather on a time of intense selfish reaction and upon a population that is cynical to the core.

One needs to bear in mind this immediate background to the various programs set forth for it is perhaps the lack of any inclusive cause or ideal of service that insulates labor and capital. The appeal of loyalty to employer has small effect with the trade unionist whose attachment is to his own group. The appeal for co-operation in national rehabilitation seems also to fall on deaf ears, while the high conception of all industry as social service seems aborted by the fear that any voluntary sacrifice at one point will be pulled in as profit at some other point or ever the benefit reaches the public whom one would serve. Wherever industrial democracy proceeds to the point represented by shop councils there is the danger that labor and capital will, in that particular industry, combine against the public. The gainful desires of both parties may be fully met and the public will pay the bill. In fact the deepest fear that has beset the American public during the post-war turmoil has been the fear that the vaunted government of the whole people would abdicate, leaving the vast unorganized populace at the mercy of the two organized groups—capital and labor. The likelihood of such an outcome is perhaps not so remote as some think.

Part I on "Working Men and Women" (pp. 15-32) should be read with great care. This preview of the very practical problems confronting the laborer will add interest to the comparative study of programs later on. The one inclusive problem of creating "an industrial democracy within or subsidiary to that political democracy which has been fought for in the present war" can be taken to involve not only representation within industry but the articulation of industry with the state. In fact the fundamental issue emerging now and again is whether the political state evolved by war, fostered by sovereignties and finally arriving at representative government, can be as strong as the united labor groups or as the alliance of capitalist groups or as any combination of the two. At the present time the unorganized public wonders whether its civil rights would fare any better under the ascendancy of industrial groups than they have fared when military groups were in control. If by "industrial democracy" one means the government of all by the industrial group then the defenders of real democracy are sharply challenged. If, on the other hand, one means a larger application of democratic methods to industry there is, no doubt, much to be said in its favor; although, if experience teaches much in this field, it is to the effect that the elective

method of securing ability and the committee method of executive effort and the suspicion which refrains from centralizing authority all make for inefficiency. It remains to be seen whether inefficiency of this sort is not the price to be paid for social contentment.

Within this main problem a great number of specific issues will be found, and it is the temporary, specific issue which usually engages American thought. The first of these to be considered is the very important one of women in industry. Objection is made that the social theory determining women's protection is concerned only with woman as mother or prospective mother and not with her as a person. It is quite to be expected, however, that with equal suffrage the state will revise and enlarge this limited view of woman, bringing her industrial status to an identity with that of man when other things are equal. But as one measure of evolution is differentiation of function or increasing division of labor the problem arises as to whether an identical industrial rôle for men and women will, after all, make for social progress. A living wage for husbands and fathers along with such social insurance as will adequately protect the families of workingmen certainly makes for the efficiency of the home and the better care of children. Moreover, with all due regard to the insistence by women that they be treated as "persons," it must be said that an industrialism which ignores the remote as well as the immediate prospect of motherhood is self-defeating and blind to the facts of life.

In taking up the next item—*the right to work*—it is interesting to note that the post-war situation is so different from the general prediction of involuntary unemployment that the acute issue centers rather in *the right to quit work*. With the lamented discontinuance of the Federal Employment Service the right to work is thrown back upon the scant mercy of the predatory employment agencies, with the dangerous prospect that, if labor should again become plentiful, the old abuses of improper distribution, suffering, and demoralization would reappear. If the reader is interested to know what these evils are in normal times he will find in Frances A. Kellor's book *Out of Work* a full and reliable description.

On the other hand a great struggle is now on for the purpose of determining the right of organized labor to strike. Because unions are not incorporated and subject to damage suits for breach of contract, and because the arbitrary cessation of labor in public utilities and vital industries involves grave loss and suffering to the public, and because the central principle of law and government demands an orderly legal hearing and adjustment of difficulties as contrasted with resort to force, this movement for compulsory arbitration is more active and insistent today than ever before. The experiment of Governor Allen of Kansas in compelling labor to submit to this method and the current debate between him and President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, marks an epoch in the development of labor policy in the United States. It is an open question as to whether the findings of such a court, when unsatisfactory to labor, could be enforced, and as to whether the conditions in the great industrial centers, as contrasted with those of Kansas, would permit a corresponding chance of success. The logical evolution of court method to cover the major issues of an industrial society seems rational, as does also the legal imposition of responsibility commensurate with the power acquired by labor unions, and one would think that those who

have been so pronounced in denouncing "privilege" would hardly feel at home in claiming such a "privilege" as is granted to no other organization. The breaking of contracts at will, like the violation of treaties, leads surely to the anarchy of war.

On the other side of the question organized labor is united in the belief that to lose the right to strike is to lose the power to bargain and that to force a man to continue at given work against his will is slavery. The case is further complicated by labor's lack of faith in tribunals of all sorts, and of this kind in particular, together with a measure of that intolerance which usually accompanies the consciousness of new-found and growing power. Whether the issue will be pressed to the ultimate point of testing the power of civil government to represent and protect all of the people remains to be seen. Recent notable strikes have been so timed and directed against such industries as to produce for the first time in the United States a popular anti-union sentiment, to stir many to volunteer as workers in the threatened industries so as to alleviate danger and suffering and to bring within sight the possibility of government operation under military law. Any solution seems remote indeed unless a working ideal of service to all supplant profiteering on the one hand and wage extortion on the other. Ultimately no theory of the respective rights of the two contending parties will suffice. Primary regard for the gains of either or of both will but aggravate avarice. So long as the American mind fails to cherish the service ideal so long will it be morally bankrupt and acutely unhappy whether in industry or in international relations. There may be some show of prosperity in our contemporary welter of selfishness, but at the same time we are doomed to the misery and the mistakes of self-seeking.

The proposals of the reconstruction programs relative to land settlement for soldiers and public works to guarantee employment have amounted to little. In the first place the effect of the war experience in removing young men from the farm has been very pronounced and the higher wages to be had in industry has accelerated the cityward movement, so that we have an acute labor shortage on the land while at the same time the absorption of good land is so nearly complete that the government has almost no attractive offers of land settlement to make to service men. As for public works, instead of the expansion contemplated retrenchment is the order of the day. The shortage of labor plus the high price of all materials and the rapid increase of tax rates dictate a policy the exact reverse of that which was expected. And since a few months have sufficed to show how fallible the economic forecast and program may be in certain respects it is the part of wisdom to avoid dogmatism in this field and to maintain mobility of mind and of social structure. Incidentally it is a good thing that the cost of war on its material side should come home to all the people in order to fortify them against the hypnotism of its false glory. We have just begun to pay the fiddler and the fee includes, we are told, many fortunes suddenly acquired under cover of "patriotism." Many who endured suffering, privation, hazard, and the loss of their loved ones have reacted into a cynicism which renders doubly difficult the maintenance of such faith and good will as are indispensable for the conduct of industry.

On the matter of hours all of the programs agree in favor of the eight-hour day in the United States and several of them stipulate the forty-four-hour week.

Probably the marked decline in output is due more to ill will and indifference than to shorter hours, and so measures the broken morale in industry rather than the curtailment of the working day. The difficulty of securing formal agreement in such matters is not so great as that of securing hearty co-operation. The eight-hour day is clearly desirable and will, no doubt, make possible a richer life for employees in general, but while we are in the present temper and the world is short of essential commodities what is more needed than an eight-hour day in which soldiering on the job is very common is the purpose to serve and deliver our fellow-men in quite the same spirit that won the war. To believe that this spirit is possible if all parties to the industrial struggle would lay their cards on the table asking only a fair consideration in profits and wages and if the imperative needs of the hungry, ill-clad, and homeless were pressed upon them in such a way as their plight really warrants—to believe capital and labor capable of heroic response is to hold by a faith that is now in eclipse. What has maimed the service ideal, doubled costs, and divided output is the conviction on the part of the worker that his product does not go through fair and open channels to the needs of the world but is diverted by the profiteers posted all along the course so that they who already have too much get still more.

It is easy to see that, in so far as such an idea is cherished, productivity is paralyzed and that the worker is also bent upon taking out of the process every cent of wages that can by any means be extracted. It is not, as I see it, fundamentally the question of a living wage that governs the struggle at the present time, not even that proper and generous construction of a living wage which must cover far more than subsistence. It is rather the idea of "doing those who would do you" and of getting everything possible out of an imaginary and unlimited fund. It is the purpose to win in the struggle and to win *en masse*, carrying the incompetent and ill-trained in a group loyalty which must be arbitrary in order to win. For such a militant condition the long experience of less than a living wage forms the somber background. Generations of dependency upon captains of industry who rewarded labor so poorly that the worker saw his wife and children drafted to mill and factory and all of them together battling for insecure subsistence finally produced the world-wide revolt. He now proposes to test out by collective means, however drastic, the possibility of their deliverance, engaging to protect his children to the age of sixteen and to command health, self-respect, security, and the amenities of life for his family. Beyond this, since values are by common consent registered in things and in the "nice" and luxurious belongings of the rich, he proposes to acquire without delay a considerable array of those things which seem to make people happy and which at any rate are the badges of prosperity. If consumption of this sort is the measure of life, then he proposes to burn up as much gasoline as the next man and to boost the standard of living to the silk-shirt level. The display standards of city life in which he moves favor this and the *nouveaux riches* lead the procession. Consequently a living wage as formerly understood is revised upward without limit, and when we consider our failure as a nation to create other standards of value in beauty, knowledge, righteousness, and their allies it becomes us to exercise tolerance toward the children who are grabbing at every bright and noisy thing. If we really had dominant a religion other than practical materialism the case would be different.

Next in the programs comes social insurance. It represents a rapid social distribution of the hazards of industry and practically rests upon the thesis that involuntary unemployment, accident, disability, old age, and, to a degree, family support are a legitimate charge upon capital, labor, and society working jointly. Of late years great interest in such insurance has developed in the United States, and upon the basis of European experience as described by Frankel and Dawson<sup>1</sup> various state commissions have been working out systems suited to American conditions. The complexities involved cannot be treated in this course, but the reader may pursue the subject with profit by consulting such books as Charles R. Henderson's *Industrial Insurance in the United States* (The University of Chicago Press), Henry R. Seager's *Social Insurance* (The Macmillan Co.), and W. F. Willoughby's *Workingmen's Insurance* (Thomas T. Crowell and Co.). Much debate revolves about the problem of the distribution of costs as between the labor union, the employer, and the state. For the sake of thrift and self-respect on the part of the laborer it would seem right that he carry a part of the cost through his union dues, while the assessment upon the employer has been found to stimulate progress in sanitation and safety, and the share of the state or public represents its responsibility for the conditions under which industry is sanctioned. In the most radical form of insurance, that known as mothers' pensions, and adopted by practically every state in the Union the state itself, for protection against dependency and juvenile delinquency, grants to mothers who are suitable persons to care for their children such monthly allowances as will enable them to maintain the family home. This is on the supposition that when the breadwinner is lost to the family it is better public policy to insure the mother's care for her children under sixteen years than to force her to such outside employment as must involve their neglect. Although such a policy is now in general use some doubt exists as to whether such a state pension system using county funds can prove as soundly constructive as the method whereby the laborer, the industry, and the state combine to cover both immediate and future liability. Furthermore the history of pensions is not flattering. It will be noted that one or two of the programs advocate the extension of war-risk insurance to include all workers. The direction of the movement is socialistic and the existing insurance companies are naturally unfriendly unless the business can be handled through them. But, avoiding detail, it ought to be clear that with the passing of the years the laborer in a given industry comes to have some vested right therein and that his protection in illness, disability, and old age is in part a charge upon the industry itself. It is further clear that the laborer's wages should be such and his moral responsibility and self-respect such that he could and would contribute systematically toward the same security. To leave him out is to weaken and pauperize him. In the third place the service ideal should so possess industry and consequently should so dispose the public mind thereto that in addition to the sense of collective responsibility whereby the state authorizes this, that, and the other industry there should be a sense of indebtedness impelling collective protection of those whose work in the last analysis has been for the public good. All that conduces to life is public service.

<sup>1</sup> *Workingmen's Insurance in Europe* (Russell Sage Foundation).

The next count in the reconstruction programs is education. The labor groups are keenly conscious that changes must be made. For a long time the great mass of them have seen the education of their children prematurely cut off, and perhaps an equal number have, under economic pressure, been party to the exploitation of children in industry. Now through the American Federation of Labor we get the demand that education should be for all the people, should be compulsory up to sixteen years of age, and should be projected on a part-time basis to eighteen years. There is no doubt that education is aristocratic in at least two respects. It has been evolved under the hierarchy of the professions and has been available only for those who could be withheld from wage-earning for a long period. The grammar grades prepare for high school, high school for college, and college for the professional school. It matters not that only the smallest fraction ever arrives at college or enters a profession. The system is regulated almost wholly from the top, and until recently what the vast majority will do in the world has been ignored. Whether we like it or not the civilization in which we live is industrial, and while life is more than making a living, yet productive living must be a primary concern in the education of all.

As was pointed out in Study I reconstruction is an educational process. All parties to the industrial problem need to learn a great deal more. Minds closed by choice are quite as dangerous as minds closed by necessity. The captains of industry might well undertake thorough courses in economics and sociology and might well encourage similar study on the part of their help. For, when such interests become uppermost, as they are today, safety consists not in restraint by force but in progressive enlightenment. *Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.* Consequently, looking at the educational effort of even the most radical propagandists one is inclined to think that the invitation to open discussion might accomplish more good than the strong-arm methods which are quickly capitalized by the restrained as being nothing other than persecution. We can deport persons but we cannot deport an idea. The only thing to do with an erroneous idea is to supplant it with one that is correct, one that squares with all the facts involved. Hence education of all the adults in industry, managers and employees, by methods of open expression and joint search for the truth, is greatly to be desired as bearing upon the immediate problems, as promoting mutual understanding, and as favoring rational rather than emotional action.

Another phase of education very important for industrial peace is the attempt to provide such equality of opportunity as will keep the way open upward for unusual ability even when appearing in the least favored economic class. This tenet of democracy in which our republic takes just pride is of untold value, not only as testimony to the worth of every individual, but as a means of enriching the common life and of preventing a fiery congestion in the humbler parts of the body politic. Whenever pronounced native ability is arbitrarily arrested or left unenlightened it is almost sure to assume antisocial expression. Therefore the discovery, release, and socialization of ability, wherever found, are primary duties of democracy, guaranties of progress, and bulwarks of peace. To translate this theory into educational policy means that public education from kindergarten through the university must be free to all and that means must be found



to supply scholarships for the brilliant and promising who otherwise could not continue beyond the age covered by compulsory education.

That such equality of opportunity can be provided upon the basis of our petty and irresponsible district-school systems is out of the question. State and federal support and supervision after the fashion of the Smith-Hughes legislation for vocational training must more and more come into play. And the teachers and educators themselves must have greater recognition both in the matter of pay and in the organization and improvement of education. To touch upon but one other item before leaving the rich array of suggestions in the programs, it seems best that vocational and trade training should remain in the hands of the school people who have the whole welfare of the child in mind rather than that it should be administered by representatives of the industries whose point of view might tend toward what is best for production rather than toward what is best for life.

The summaries on pages 26 to 31 of Miss Weeks's book should be carefully studied, as also the material immediately following and devoted to the acceptance of the right of collective bargaining. It is to be presumed that this right is now so generally conceded as to preclude debate and that industry has reached the point where the thorough organization of labor is recognized as an important factor in safety and progress. Organization under experienced and reliable leadership is greatly to be preferred over the irresponsible and anarchic revolts of recent months. The former stands for orderly progress; the latter for revolution.

In discussing industrial democracy, the main features of which are presented on page 40, we need to make clear again that the aim is the progressive democratization of industry rather than the creation of a democracy ruled out and out by industry, which, as in the Russian revolution, means the proletariat. The first step in the democratization of industry comes by granting the workers a voice and vote in management. This is attempted in the Whitley plan, which the reader should take up at this point. Up to date the measure of success anticipated has not been gained (see the *Survey*, June 5, 1920, pp. 336 f.), and one fails to see how the public is protected under the methods proposed. Governor Allen's question, which Mr. Gompers declined to answer in their famous debate, confronts also the Whitley plan. That question runs as follows: "When a dispute between capital and labor brings on a strike affecting the production or distribution of the necessities of life, thus threatening the public peace and impairing the public health, has the public any rights in such a controversy, or is it a private war between capital and labor?"

President Eliot proposes for employers:

Abandonment of despotic government of industries dealing with necessities.

Adoption of means to promote the health and education of employees and their families.

Universal adoption of co-operative management and discipline throughout the plant employer and employees to have equal representation in managing committees.

Careful provision for dealing with complaints of employees.

General adoption of a genuine partnership system between capital and labor whereby the returns after wages are paid shall vary with the knowledge of the accounts.

Universal acceptance of collective bargaining through elected representatives on each side.

For employees:

Abandonment of the doctrine of limited output, and of the idea of working as few hours as possible and without interest or zeal during those few.

Absolute rejection of the idea that leisure rather than work should be the object of life.

Abandonment of the idea that capital is the natural enemy of labor and that unorganized laborers are traitors to their class.

Abandonment of all violence toward persons and property in industrial disputes.

In addition to the reading of Hobson's book, which, I think, does not leave a clear case for the state as representing all the people, the reader should review the platform of the British Labor party and the "Inter-Allied Labor War Aims" as published in the *New Republic*, March 23, 1918, Parts I and II. In conclusion one comes back to the thesis that only the service ideal can save industry.

### Questions for Discussion

1. What is the argument for collective bargaining?
2. What should be done to hold organized labor to its contracts?
3. What dangers are to be met in extending the Kansas Industrial Court throughout the Union?
4. Should immigration restrictions be adjusted in the interests of production?
5. Would the elective method in industrial representation make for efficiency?
6. Should needless industries be restrained or eliminated by taxation?

## STUDY IV

### Required Books

Brown, *Christianity and Industry*.

Hodgkin (Ed.), *Quakerism and Industry*.

In the first place you must read the article by Albion W. Small in the *American Journal of Sociology*, May, 1920. Read also the *Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Committee of Inquiry* (published by The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London: 6 St. Martin's Place, W.C. 2). *The Social Principles of Jesus* by Walter Rauschenbusch (Woman's Press, 600 Lexington Ave., New York City) would also be helpful. The little book by Professor Brown is theological and general and aims to give to Y.W.C.A. secretaries a Christian attitude toward industrial problems. There is evident at the present time in the Y.W.C.A. a very lively consciousness of the call to serve in this field. Their recent conference at Cleveland, Ohio, gave evidence of the fact of their response to the great army of young women recruited to industry by war pressure and retained therein by the brisk labor demand and the high cost of living. In fact this branch of organized Christianity is showing notable open-mindedness and efficiency in the very field where organized Christianity is as a rule most gingerly in expression.

The Christlike valuation of persons seems a good starting-point for our approach (p. 17). But personality must be achieved and enlarged in relationships. Hence the central ideal of Christianity—the Kingdom of God—affords the inexhaustible goal and stimulus for the functioning of personality. Only by such a goal can it be saved from arrest and that flat disappointment which comes with the achievement of inferior ends. The Kingdom of God ideal hallows

all the stages of attainment and gathers them up in a joyful onwardness. All effort making for our oneness and progress as the family of God is satisfying to personality in the Christian sense.

Now, on the other hand, there is no real peace for the individual inwardly or for organized society unless service to this end is being rendered. To Christianize industry is to convert it to the service ideal in all its parts and functions and in that process to relate it to the needs of all mankind (see *These Things Shall Be* by George Lansbury, Swathmore Press, Ltd., London). We must run industries for people; make shoes for them; clothe them, house them, and give them food; and by doing just that we have the blessing of him who said, "I was an hungred and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me." And in so doing we do enter into the Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world, the social order of contentment eternal in the very law of life itself. So much for the principle which wherever tried automatically verifies itself, but what of the technique? First, it must be vital. They who truly have the mind of Christ will be mediating it no matter what the vocation. Without that spirit the formal guaranties of law and contract will always be lame. Selfishness is more inventive than legislation. But if on labor council or in the board of directors you have the person who is truly seeking and who is seeking primarily the largest service to all his fellow-men you will have progressively those adjustments which lead from the jungle to human brotherhood.

Turning to the second of the required books one feels that the Friends have perhaps gone farther than any other Christian group in demonstrating applied Christianity. They are distinguished by the simplicity and fidelity with which they seek to express the spirit of Jesus in everyday affairs. The conference reported in this book may be regarded as an orderly attempt to discover how the spirit of the Master may be applied in large-scale industries. For the Quaker it is not sufficient that he be governed by the labor market, purchasing labor as a commodity. He must take a human, Christian interest in his employees. Chairman Rowntree strikes the center of the current problem when he says, "We live in an age of political democracy and industrial autocracy." Hence we know at the very outset that the conference was not primarily concerned with outlining the practice of "the good employer," of whom the Quakers have many conspicuous examples, or with the philanthropies for which they are equally notable, but rather with the inclusive problem of democratizing industry. The reader will gain greater benefit from the discussion by reading the report itself first (pp. 129-42). As an expression of the service ideal limited to national scope, which although not perfect is still far beyond the prevailing idea in industry, one reads with satisfaction the quotation from Mr. Hichens: "Unless industry is really recognized as primarily a national service, in which each individual is fulfilling his function to the best of his ability for the sake of the community, in which private gain is subordinated to public good, in which, in a word, we carry out our duty towards our neighbour—unless we build on this foundation, there is no hope of creating the House Beautiful." In addition to the addresses by labor leaders the questions and replies (pp. 36-43) are full of interest, especially those revealing labor's attitude toward the church.

The question whether the basic wage should be based on need or efficiency seems to be the main item in the next section. If family conditions are to determine the wages paid, merit may go by the board and the heads of large families will be the last to be employed and the first to be laid off. Can society afford to eliminate the premium placed upon thrift, efficiency, and good judgment by asking an industry to assume the care of all its people irrespective of the wide range in productivity? A basic wage equal to the cost of living for a man and wife and three children may cover pretty well the large percentage of cases, but after all each case needs to be treated on its own merits and one wonders whether a relationship might not be worked out whereby the concern working jointly as through the shop's council should fully consider every case and make a great variety of adjustments in the nature of a compromise, if necessary, between merit and need. For workmen and management to co-operate in such human problems might help both toward vital relations and a better spirit. Of course the idea that the industry can bear any and every expense can be dispelled by a frank showing of the facts now unknown to the workers, and it might well be that a clear view of the relation of the worker's productivity to the concern's power to care for him, his family, and his fellows would stimulate him to greater loyalty and effort. That is that the family ideal be taken up in some real degree by the industry and that the returns to all and the care for all be based on collective productivity. Not that each one will get or can get the exact equivalent of his labor for any given week or month but that all will be safe and will be sure of a living within the mutual undertaking and will prosper or lose as the concern itself succeeds or fails. The exceptional burdens are borne by all, and the very power to do this and to provide life and more life for the whole group rests upon each one doing his best in the place for which he is best fitted.

These are some of the reflections that come to one as he reads the report and learns the sensitiveness of labor as to its status, its resentment of discipline by arbitrary management, and the desire of the best persons in both camps to supplant the present impersonal and militant struggle by a human relationship which will bring out the best rather than the worst in men. Great gains and great fortunes might well be eliminated from the industrial prospect if only great and satisfactory living and hearty, effective brotherhood might come to pass therein. The prospect of maintaining discipline and morale from above and as administered by those who get the profits is waning, and the moral salvation of industry seems to depend upon the development of self-discipline from within, while this in turn depends upon the sure guaranty of collective benefit. The Christian aim as I see it is that of creating this mutuality within the industry, together with the creation of a sense of responsibility to society commensurate with the renewal of power and productivity thus achieved.

Finally one is forced to the conclusion that while systems can and must be improved they will not of themselves constitute a solution. Neither will education of itself and as ordinarily understood fully meet the case. This need is urgent and entirely just and must be answered, but if the better-trained mind remains self-seeking and suspicious the struggle may be made thereby only the more bitter. Only the attitude and mind of Jesus of Nazareth can save industry, and his spirit operates in the soul of man. Unless the whole population can be

reached and won to his way of life friction and failure must continue, while in the degree that men experience his passion of brotherhood and service in that degree will they work out industrial salvation.

**Questions for Discussion**

1. How would you explain organized labor's apathy toward the church?
2. Do you think that the recent financial campaigns have commended the church to the common people?
3. Suggest some feasible lines of approach to an industrial population.
4. Outline a pertinent Christian message to employers.
5. Outline a pertinent Christian message to employees.
6. Make a list of any benefits you may have derived from this reading course.